DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 340 429 JC 920 035

AUTHOR Belcher, Marcia J.
TITLE How Are We Doing? Institutional Research Looks at Itself.
INSTITUTION Miami-Dade Community Coll., Fla. Office of Institutional Research.
REPORT NO M-DCC-IR-91-14R
PUB DATE Dec 91
NOTE 56p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; Decision Making; Diffusion (Communication); *Institutional Research; Questionnaires; *Research Utilization; Self Evaluation (Groups); State Surveys; Tables (Data); Two Year Colleges; *User Satisfaction (Information); Use Studies
IDENTIFIERS *Miami Dade Community College FL

ABSTRACT

In 1991, a study was conducted to determine the effectiveness of the institutional research (IR) office at Miami-Dade Community College (M-DCC). Two surveys were used to gather information for the study. The first was sent to the 285 M-DCC employees and board members on the IR office's mailing list, while the second was sent to 43 individuals, including IR personnel at other Florida community colleges, personnel at the Division of Community Colleges, and members of the Post-Secondary Education Planning Commission. Overall, about 35% of those surveyed at M-DCC returned their questionnaires, while statewide, 62% of those surveyed responded. Results indicated a high level of information use of IR reports by M-DCC respondents, and the vast majority of respondents found the information useful in decision making. IR publications generally received high ratings on the dimensions of timeliness of information, usefulness of information, readability, accuracy, ability to sustain interest, and objectivity. In addition, respondents who had requested individual information from the office in the previous 6 months were almost uniformly pleased with the information and help they received. Results from the statewide survey were also generally positive. Almost all (90%) of the respondents were aware of M-DCC's Institutional Research office, and 70% had used the results of M-DCC studies in their own work. On every area of the survey, over 85% of the respondents rated the office as "good" or "excellent." Appendixes provide survey results and questionnaires. (JMC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED340429

HOW ARE WE DOING?
INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH LOOKS AT ITSELF

Research Report No. 91-14R

December 1991

IR
Miami-Dade Community College
District Administration

Institutional Research

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Marcia Belcher

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

JC 920 035

Miami-Dade Community College

MIAMI-DADE IS AN EQUAL ACCESS/EQUAL OPPORTUNITY COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND DOES NOT DISCRIMINATE ON THE BASIS OF HANDICAP. 4/88

HOW ARE WE DOING?
INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH LOOKS AT ITSELF

Research Report No. 91-14R

December 1991

Marcia J. Belcher
Research Associate. Sr.

Miami-Dade Community College

OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

John Losak, Dean

December 16, 1991

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Institutional Research Readership

FROM: John Losak

SUBJECT: REFLECTIONS ON THE EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

When Marcia Belcher and I first started talking about this project a year ago, it seemed that we should commit resources to get underway as quickly as we reasonably could so as to again have at least two evaluations of the area before the next SACS reaccreditation visit due in 1995. This is the first time that we have formally asked persons outside the college to give us feedback.

Marcia has organized the Research Report in a manner which presents not only the results but also verbatim comments that colleagues made. One of the more surprising findings was that only one-third of those requested to respond at Miami-Dade did so, while two-thirds from outside of Miami-Dade responded. I am curious about the low response rate and wonder whether the non-respondents have views which are similar to the respondents. There were many favorable comments about our operation which reflect very well on the strong professional staff that has been gathered in Institutional Research. Recognition must also be given to the on-going philosophical support provided by the College President as well as to the commitment of resources to carry out the work.

One issue raised in the past is still eliciting comments, and that is the question of how much research focus should be on the individual campuses. For every report, we try to consider the relative emphasis to provide for campus-based versus college-wide analysis. Several respondents indicated they would like to see more attention to campus-level findings.

The suggestions for further study are always helpful in identifying topics of interest. We have already issued an Information Capsule

on the PSAV programs, a topic suggested by one respondent. However, some of the requests for studies appear to be asking for research on topics which we have already addressed to some extent. In Appendix H, we have tried to identify the specific Research Reports or Information Capsules which we think address many of the topics that are being asked for by the respondents.

I believe that some of the strength of the Institutional Research office comes from the on-going evaluative approach we apply toward our daily operations. Ideas are usually discussed in some detail before a project is undertaken; draft copies of findings are shared among the professional staff before writing is begun; every paper is read by at least two members of the staff who check both content and format; and finally, we observe internal quality control processes designed to assure accuracy of the multitude of numbers which we handle.

I want to take this opportunity to thank each of you who participated in the evaluation for your help. We take your comments seriously and welcome the opportunity to respond to your requests for information and your suggestions for improvement.

JL/rmz

RZ0086

Table of Contents

Page

List of Tables ii

Introduction 1

Methodology 1

Results 3

Level of Information Use -- M-DCC Respondents 3

Evaluation of IR Publications by M-DCC Readership 4

Strengths, Weaknesses, and Proposed Changes as Viewed by M-DCC Readership 5

Response to Individualized Requests 7

Beyond M-DCC -- Perceptions Around the State 8

Other Indicators 9

Summary 10

Appendix A - 20-28

Appendix B - 29-34

Appendix C - 35-37

Appendix D - 38-39

Appendix E - 40-42

Appendix F - 43

Appendix G - 44-45

Appendix H - 46-49

List of Tables

Table		Page
1	Number Who Received and Returned Survey by Job Title	13
2	Survey of Miami-Dade Community College Readership Area of Responsibility of Respondents	14
3	Survey of Miami-Dade Community College Readership Items Related to Levels of Information Use	15
4	Survey of Miami-Dade Community College Readership Items Related to Institutional Research Publications by Constituency	16
5	Survey of Miami-Dade Community College Readership Opinions About Service Provided for Individual Information Requests	17
6	Items Related to Miami-Dade's Institutional Research Office As a State-Level Resource	18
7	Items Related to Performance as Viewed by Those Outside Miami-Dade Community College	19

Figure		
1	Level of Information Use by M-DCC Readership	3

How are We Doing?
Institutional Research Looks at Itself

Introduction

Your hotel wanted to know. So did the restaurant where you had lunch. Even the bug spray company was curious. They all wanted to know how you evaluated them on several characteristics important to their business. They all knew their job was to provide service to others.

It is now quite common to find businesses in the private sector asking how they can improve their service to you, the customer. It is less common to see a customer orientation in the public sector. Yet even there it is coming to pass.

At Miami-Dade, the Dean of the Office of Institutional Research decided that it was time to ask the question **"How are we doing?"** and to seek answers in more direct ways than we have in the past. We knew at least some people read our reports because they talked about them or requested further information. While this is good information in the same way that it is good information to know the sales volume in a business, it failed to provide us with information about how much better we might do and ways in which we might improve.

There were several forces to push us in this direction. Internally, one piece of the Teaching/Learning Project has been to urge service areas to evaluate their functioning. Externally, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools now mandates both an Office of Institutional Research and an evaluation of that office as part of accreditation. Thus, in April of 1991 surveys went out to ask the question **"How are we doing?"**.

Methodology

As a first step, a document was developed which identified key indicators of an effective Institutional Research Office, key constituencies who needed to be surveyed, and

other indicators of productivity and effectiveness (see Appendix A). We assumed that an effective IR office:

--provides information that influences decision-making.
--is accurate and unbiased.
--is productive.
--anticipates and meets the need of its users.
--is timely.
--is visible.

Surveys were then developed by John Losak and Marcia Belcher with input from several users and the rest of the Institutional Research office staff. It was agreed that we should be evaluated primarily by our immediate constituency--M-DCC readers of our reports and requesters of tailored information--and secondarily by those within our sphere of influence around the state.

Two surveys were developed. One was sent to all 285 M-DCC employees and board members currently on our mailing list who receive all of our information capsules and all abstracts of research reports. A second survey was sent to 43 individuals who were Institutional Research personnel at other Florida community colleges or personnel at the Division of Community Colleges or the Post-Secondary Education Planning Commission. (See Appendix A for surveys and accompanying letters.)

M-DCC 's readership list consists mainly of administrators. As shown by Table 1, about 35% were labelled "other professionals", 30% were department chairpersons, and 22% were deans or associate deans, 8% were faculty, and 5% were Presidents or Vice-Presidents. Overall, about 35% of those surveyed at M-DCC returned their questionnaires. However, since deans, presidents, and faculty were more likely to return their surveys, they are somewhat over-represented in the reporting of results. Most respondents were responsible for multiple areas, though the academic side was most strongly represented (see Table 2).

The return rate for the state-wide survey was higher--62% of those surveyed returned their questionnaires. Most (68%) of the questionnaires were completed by Institutional Research personnel at other community colleges. (See Table 1 for further details.)

Level of Information Use -- M-DCC Respondents

The Office of Institutional Research knows how many report abstracts and information capsules are mailed to its readership. What is not known is what happens to this information after it leaves the office.

At the most basic level, intended readers may not even be aware of having received IR publications. At the next level is the issue of processing of information through reading or skimming. Did readers find the time to at least skim or read what was sent to them? If they read it and find it valuable, did they move to the next level of sharing that information with others? At the most intensive levels of information use, the reader uses the information provided in decision-making or takes the initiative to request information that specifically conforms to their needs.

Figure 1 presents a summary of these levels of reported information use along with survey results. Results indicated fairly high participation at all levels. Everyone knew that they had received research capsules and abstracts and everyone said they read at least some of them. A strong majority--88%--shared information with others, at least occasionally. Slightly fewer (81%) rated the information useful in decision-making. A minority (41%) used the IR office in a more direct fashion, requesting individual information.

Start:	Sent	100%			
Level I:	Received	100%			
Level II:	Read or Skimmed	100%			
Level III:	Shared With Others	88%			
Level IV:	Useful in Decision Making	81%			
Level V:	Requested Individual Information	41%			

Figure 1. Level of Information Use by M-DCC Readership.

Tables provide more detail on the information used in Figure 1. As shown by Table 3, over 75% of respondents said they read almost all of the reports, while 35% shared information on a frequent basis. Under the category of "Usefulness of Information", 36% rated the publications as "excellent" and 45% rated them as "above average" (see Table 4).

Evaluation of IR Publications by M-DCC Readership

The Institutional Research Office is known to most people almost solely through its publications. Readers, therefore, were asked to evaluate IR's publications on six dimensions: timeliness of information, usefulness of information, readability, accuracy, ability to sustain interest, and objectivity. The results are displayed in Table 4.

Overall, IR publications rated high on each of the dimensions. On timeliness, accuracy, and objectivity, over 90% of the respondents rated the publications as "good" or "excellent". Faculty gave somewhat lower ratings on timeliness and accuracy, and other professionals have lower ratings on timeliness than other groups.

In the areas of readability and usefulness of information, over 80% of the respondents rated IR publications as "good" or "excellent". Faculty were least likely to provide high ratings on usefulness, while presidents and vice-presidents were most likely to rate the reports' readability as "average".

Lowest ratings were given to the reports' ability to sustain interest in a topic. Slightly over 70% of readers rated IR publications as "good" or "excellent" on this dimension.

As part of the survey, readers were asked to list research reports that they found particularly interesting or helpful, those that needed improvement, and ones which they had shared with others. The results can be found in Appendix B. Generally, readers recalled a variety of reports as being useful. Most frequently mentioned, however, were CLAST reports and those that dealt with student demographics. These were also the reports that were most likely to be shared. It was surprising to find that most people did not mention the Factbook since summaries from a wide variety of data can be found there.

No particular report stood out when readers were asked for ones which needed improvement. In fact, the most common response was that there were none. See Appendix B for further information.

Strengths, Weaknesses, and Proposed Changes as Viewed by M-DCC Readership

Another part of the survey posed the following questions:

What do you think is the Institutional Research Office's greatest strength?

What would most improve Institutional Research's performance?

What issue of topic would you like to see Institutional Research address during the next six months?

Responses were analyzed and grouped according to content to more readily understand patterns of responses.

Responses related to IR's strengths were placed into five categories: data access and quality, proactive stance, personnel/human resources, helpfulness/flexibility, and other (see Appendix C). By far, the most frequent responses related to IR's ability to gather data and the accuracy of information, a response that is not too surprising since that is the main activity of the office. A sampling of responses included the following:

Accurate and objective data regarding students, especially their CLAST, MAPS scores across campuses, over time.

It's access to the computer!

Accessibility to data not available to others, or readily available to others.

Other people, however, talked about the office having a proactive stance, as described in comments such as "spotting need to know information before people realize they need to know it" and "the ability to 'predict' what information I need". Others thought the quality of the staff was a particular strength. A willingness to help when asked for information, though related to quality of staff, was placed under a separate category entitled "Helpful-

ness/Flexibility". The last category, "Other", consisted of a variety of responses; most related to objectivity and content of reports.

Responses to the question on suggested improvements were sorted into six categories: planning and linking, changes in presentation of results, campus-level focus, resources, topics, and other. The full text of responses can be found in Appendix D.

The comments placed under "Planning and Linking" mainly included suggestions to get more input from departments and to talk about research priorities with campus administrators. A related area was "campus-level focus" where respondents requested more campus-level and campus-specific information. These two combined themes encompassed what was probably the strongest theme of this question: paying more attention specifically to the campuses.

Others focused on potential changes in presentation of results. Suggestions included verbal discussion, overviews, shorter articles, clearer writing, and redesign of the Factbook. A few mentioned more resources for the IR office or other research topics (see Appendix D).

The final qualitative question under this section asked readers what issues or topics they would like to see IR address during the next six months (see Appendix E for results). By far, the greatest number of responses fell under a category entitled "Outcomes and Effectiveness Measures". Readers wanted to know what happened to students when ..... they participated in athletics, they took college preparatory work, they entered with different levels of basic skills, they completed their AAs and prepared to transfer, they completed their ASs and prepared to enter the job market. Others were interested in seeing effectiveness indicators developed for various program areas or in documenting the "success" (or lack of it) for minority students.

The second most frequently mentioned group of responses fell under the rubric of "Student Demographics and Profiles." There was no common focus for this area with

responses ranging from a description of PSAV enrollees, to profiles of potential M-DCC enrollees, to attitudes and characteristics.

The third area was labelled "Teaching/Learning" and included topics such as the effectiveness of part-time instructors, class size and student performance, and examination of college preparatory and ESL programs. Other suggestions under this area were for topics traditionally outside IR. They included a faculty profile and faculty assignment patterns.

The remaining two areas were "Attitudes and Beliefs" and "Financial". Suggestions under the first category included public perceptions of the college, student needs, and reasons for enrollment. Suggestions in the financial arena centered on issues such as impact of fee increases and instructional costs (including equity issues).

At the end of the survey, readers also had the opportunity to make any additional comments (see Appendix F). A large majority of these were very complimentary. Examples include:

> A great office and useful and helpful - all the time! Keep going!
>
> Staff is knowledgeable and adept at explaining and interpreting data in writing and orally. Reports and information is (sic) usually comprehensive. I rely on your office for accurate and timely information.
>
> Have always found area to be helpful within time constraints and available personnel.
>
> IR is one of the colleges most responsive and professional units.

Response to Individualized Requests

While a great deal of information is offered through IR's research reports and abstracts, we also receive numerous calls from people needing more individualized information. In fact, 41% of the respondents said that they had requested personalized information from our office in the past six months. Of this group, (with one exception) everyone agreed or strongly agreed that:

--the information they received was useful.
--they received the information within a reasonable amount of time.
--they understood the information they received.
--the person who worked with them was helpful.
--the person who worked with them was knowledgeable.
--they would work again with our office when they had a specialized data request.

From these results, it appears that fulfilling individualized requests is a strong component of the office. Full results can be found on Table 5.

Beyond M-DCC -- Perceptions Around the State

While first priority must always be placed upon serving the College constituency, Miami-Dade's IR office does not operate solely at the local level. Members of the office serve on both state and national committees. The office is required (or requested) to submit information to state-level offices such as the Division of Community Colleges and the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission. We sometimes talk to our counterparts at other community colleges or distribute particularly relevant abstracts and capsules. Thus, a second survey was distributed state-wide to see how the office is perceived and to judge the impact of our office beyond the College.

As shown by Table 6, over 90% of the respondents knew of M-DCC's Office of Institutional Research. Furthermore, over 70% had used results of M-DCC studies in their own work and 63% had sought information or help from the Office. Most of those using M-DCC data were using CLAST or college preparatory results (see Appendix G). These data confirm that our office has a state-wide presence.

Besides having a state-wide presence, M-DCC's reputation is a good one. Over 90% of respondents rated the office as "good" or "excellent" on timeliness, accuracy, readability, knowledge of state-level issues, and relevancy. The two lowest rated items were helpfulness to others in the field (90% rated as "good" or "excellent") and leader in appropriate issues (87% rated as "good" or "excellent"). See Table 7 for full details.

Again, most of the general comments made on the survey were complimentary. They include:

> M-DCC - OIR established the goal line for all other institutions.
>
> I value the priority that M-DCC places on institutional research. My work has benefitted several times from the work of the M-DCC institutional research office.
>
> The M-DCC Institutional Research office is the most outstanding one in the C.C. system and as good as any in the State University System. It is a national model for community colleges.

Other Indicators

The surveys focused on *perceptions* of the office from the viewpoint of M-DCC readers and others around the State. There are other indicators, however, especially of performance and productivity. For example, in the past two years, M-DCC's IR office has published 41 research reports and 44 information capsules. The total number of pages sent out to readers exceeded 75,000 pages.

The office has been involved in activities locally, state-wide, and nationally. As an approximation of activities in 1991, IR members served on 17 committees, made 5 presentations, spent time with 21 outside visitors, and published 16 studies and reports externally.

About half of the office resources are expended responding to state and federal reports. In the past year, the process of State report preparation has changed with many reports now generated at the State level from a student data base the office prepares and submits twice per term. Of the remaining reports, all were on time, and none required modification due to data errors.

Finally, however, what the office is all about is providing useful data for decision-making. We hope that our data can provide help in making difficult decisions. This year, IR data were used to assess the impact of an enrollment cap, both initially and over a larger period of time. In addition, IR data were used to argue that students should complete an

English and Mathematics class prior to taking the CLAST. Increased passing rates resulted. These are only two of the possible examples. The IR office was aware of these two because of direct involvement; there are many others where we have no direct knowledge.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to assess how M-DCC's Office of Institutional Research was perceived by its readership and to gather information on ways the office might be improved. Reasons for initiating the evaluation included a requirement by Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) for evaluation of IR offices as well as a recommendation from the Teaching/Learning Project's Environment subcommittee that service areas (such as Institutional Research) ask for feedback from their clientele.

The evaluation approach consisted of two surveys, supplemented by data from other indicators. One survey was sent to all 285 M-DCC personnel who were currently on the list to receive all research abstracts and information capsules. A second survey was sent to 43 individuals around the state who were involved with institutional research issues. Overall, 35% of the M-DCC surveys were returned while 62% were returned from the statewide survey.

Results indicated a high level of information use of IR reports by M-DCC respondents. Everyone read or skimmed at least some of the reports, while 88% reported sharing results with others. Slightly fewer (81%) found the information useful in decision-making. At the highest level of information use, 41% of reported contacting the office and requesting individualized data.

IR publications generally received high ratings on the dimensions of timeliness of information, usefulness of information, readability, accuracy, ability to sustain interest, and objectivity. Ratings on timeliness, accuracy, and objectivity were especially high with over 90% of M-DCC respondents rating the publications as "good" or "excellent" in these areas. Lowest ratings were given to the reports' ability to sustain interest in a topic. Slightly over

70% of M-DCC readers rated the reports as "good" or "excellent" in this area. CLAST reports and those that dealt with student demographics were most likely to be mentioned as useful or as being shared with others.

In addition, respondents who had requested individual information from the office in the past six months were almost uniformly pleased with the information and help they received. Since 40% of the respondents indicated that they had made such a request, these data document that working with individuals is a strong and frequent component of M-DCC's IR office's service.

Comments on the office's strengths were most often related to data access and quality, a proactive approach to data collection, the quality of personnel in general, and staff helpfulness and flexibility in particular. Suggested improvements fell into six categories: planning and linking, changes in presentations of results, a greater campus-level focus, more resources, additional topics to address, and other. The most recurrent theme was improvement of campus-level communication and data. When asked directly what additional issues or topics IR should address in the next six months, most responses fell under a category labelled "Outcomes and Effectiveness Measures". A full text of comments is included in the appendices of the report.

Results from the state-wide survey also were generally very positive. Almost all (90%) of the respondents were aware of M-DCC's Office of Institutional Research, and 70% had used results of M-DCC studies in their own work. On every area of the survey, over 85% of the respondents rated the office as "good" or "excellent".

Activities which were included under the "Other Indicators" category covered a broad spectrum. In the past two years, the office produced 44 information capsules and 41 full-blown research reports, totalling over 75,000 pages distributed to readers. This year, office staff served on 17 committees, spent time with 21 outside visitors, and published 16 studies and reports externally. All state reports were both timely and accurate. Administra-

tors used IR data to make decisions about the impact of the enrollment cap and eligibility to write the CLAST (to name a few).

In general, then, Miami-Dade's Office of Institutional Research appears to be well-known both within the College and around the State. Its reputation is one of producing timely and accurate data which address current problems and issues. In fact, a national survey completed last year as part of doctoral research found that M-DCC's Office of Institutional Research was ranked the top IR office in the country.

Among all these strengths, the weaker areas appeared to be sustaining readers' interest in data-based research reports, presenting data which are more directly focused on the campuses, and initiating more effectiveness and outcome indicator studies. A study one or two years from now should provide an update on progress in these areas.

Table 1

Number Who Received and Returned Survey
by Job Title

	Number of Mailouts	Percent of Total Mailouts	Number of Returns	Percent of Total Returns	Percent of Mailouts Returned
Miami-Dade Community College Survey					
Department Chair	72	29.6	24	28.2	33.3
Dean/Associate Dean	53	21.8	21	24.7	39.6
Presidents/Vice-Presidents	12	4.9	9	10.6	75.0
Other Professionals	86	35.4	21	24.7	24.4
Faculty	20	8.3	9	10.6	45.0
Unknown	-	-	1	1.2	-
Total	243	100.0	85	100.0	35.0
Statewide Survey					
Division of Community Colleges	10	22.2	4	14.3	40.0
Post-Secondary Education Commission (PEPC)	7	15.6	5	17.9	71.4
Research Function in Community College	28	62.2	19	67.8	67.8
Total	45	100.0	28	100.0	62.2

AB158.1

Table 2

Survey of Miami-Dade Community College Readership
Area of Responsibility of Respondents

Area of Responsibility	Frequency	Percent
Academic Affairs	14	22.6
Student Services	15	24.2
Business & Finance	2	3.2
Classroom	7	11.3
Multiple Areas	24	38.7

Frequency missing = 23

AB158.2

Table 3

Survey of Miami-Dade Community College Readership
Items Related to Levels of Information Use

	Frequency	Percent
Do You Receive Institutional Research Publications?		
Yes	85	100.0
No	0	0.0
Do You Read Institutional Research Publications?		
No	0	0.0
Yes, a Few	4	4.7
Yes, Many	16	18.8
Yes, Almost All	65	76.5
Do You Share Information		
No	10	11.8
Occasionally	45	52.9
Often	30	35.3
Request Information Within Past Six Months		
No	50	58.8
Yes	35	41.2

AB158.2

Table 4

Survey of Miami-Dade Community College Readership
Items Related to Institutional Research Publications by Constituency

	Poor		Mediocre		Average		Good		Excellent		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Timeliness of Topic												
Department Chair	0	-	0	-	1	4.2	16	66.7	7	29.1	24	100.0
Deans/Associate Deans	0	-	0	-	2	9.5	11	52.4	8	38.1	21	100.0
Presidents/Vice Presidents	0	-	0	-	0	-	5	55.6	4	44.4	9	100.0
Other Professionals	0	-	0	-	3	15.0	13	65.0	4	20.0	20	100.0
Faculty	0	-	0	-	1	11.1	6	66.7	2	22.2	9	100.0
Total	0	-	0	-	7	8.4	51	61.5	25	30.1	83	100.0
Frequency Missing = 2												
Usefulness of Information												
Department Chair	0	-	0	-	4	17.4	11	47.8	8	34.8	23	100.0
Deans/Associate Deans	0	-	0	-	4	19.0	9	42.9	8	38.1	21	100.0
Presidents/Vice Presidents	0	-	0	-	1	11.1	3	33.3	5	55.6	9	100.0
Other Professionals	0	-	1	5.2	3	15.8	9	47.4	6	31.6	19	100.0
Faculty	0	-	0	-	3	33.3	4	44.5	2	22.2	9	100.0
Total	0	-	1	1.2	15	18.5	36	44.5	29	35.8	81	100.0
Frequency Missing = 4												
Readability												
Department Chair	0	-	0	-	2	8.3	10	41.7	12	50.0	24	100.0
Deans/Associate Deans	0	-	0	-	3	14.3	10	47.6	8	38.1	21	100.0
Presidents/Vice Presidents	0	-	0	-	3	33.3	2	22.2	4	44.5	9	100.0
Other Professionals	0	-	1	5.0	3	15.0	7	35.0	9	45.0	20	100.0
Faculty	0	-	0	-	1	11.1	6	66.7	2	22.2	9	100.0
Total	0	-	1	1.2	12	14.4	35	42.2	35	42.2	83	100.0
Frequency Missing = 2												
Accuracy												
Department Chair	0	-	0	-	1	5.3	5	26.3	13	68.4	19	100.0
Deans/Associate Deans	0	-	0	-	0	-	8	53.3	7	46.7	15	100.0
Presidents/Vice Presidents	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	11.1	8	88.9	9	100.0
Other Professionals	0	-	0	-	1	6.7	3	20.0	11	73.3	15	100.0
Faculty	0	-	0	-	1	12.5	4	50.0	3	37.5	8	100.0
Total	0	-	0	-	3	4.6	21	31.8	42	63.6	66	100.0
Frequency Missing = 19												
Sustains Interest in Topic												
Department Chair	0	-	0	-	6	26.1	11	47.8	6	26.1	23	100.0
Deans/Associate Deans	0	-	0	-	7	33.3	9	42.9	5	23.8	21	100.0
Presidents/Vice Presidents	0	-	0	-	1	11.1	6	66.7	2	22.2	9	100.0
Other Professionals	0	-	0	-	6	31.6	7	36.8	6	31.6	19	100.0
Faculty	0	-	0	-	3	33.3	5	55.6	1	11.1	9	100.0
Total	0	-	0	-	23	28.4	38	46.9	20	24.7	81	100.0
Frequency Missing = 4												
Objectivity												
Department Chair	0	-	1	4.3	2	8.7	8	34.8	12	52.2	23	100.0
Deans/Associate Deans	0	-	1	5.0	2	10.0	8	40.0	9	45.0	20	100.0
Presidents/Vice Presidents	0	-	0	-	0	-	2	22.2	7	77.8	9	100.0
Other Professionals	0	-	0	-	2	10.5	6	31.6	11	57.9	19	100.0
Faculty	0	-	0	-	1	11.1	6	66.7	2	22.2	9	100.0
Total	0	-	2	2.5	7	8.7	30	37.5	41	51.3	80	100.0
Frequency Missing = 5												

AB158.3

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 5

Survey of Miami-Dade Community College Readership
Opinions about Service Provided for Individual Information Requests

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Information Received was Useful Frequency Missing = 3	0	-	1	3.1	0	-	10	31.3	21	65.6	32	100.0
Received Information Within Reasonable Time Frequency Missing = 3	0	-	0	-	0	-	9	28.1	23	71.9	32	100.0
Understood Information Received Frequency Missing = 5	0	-	0	-	0	-	7	23.3	23	76.7	30	100.0
Person Who Worked With Me Was Helpful Frequency Missing = 2	0	-	0	-	0	-	5	15.2	28	84.8	33	100.0
Person Who Helped Was Knowledgeable Frequency Missing = 2	0	-	0	-	0	-	7	21.2	26	78.8	33	100.0
Will Work With Institutional Research Again Frequency Missing = 3	0	-	0	-	0	-	3	9.4	29	90.6	32	100.0

Table 6

Items Related to Miami-Dade's Institutional Research Office
As a State-Level Resource

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Are You Familiar With M-DCC Institutional Research Office?				
Not Familiar	2	7.1	2	7.1
Somewhat Familiar	17	60.7	19	67.9
Very Familiar	9	32.1	28	100.0
Have You Used Results of M-DCC Studies?				
No	8	29.6	8	29.6
Yes	19	70.4	27	100.0
Have You Sought Information or Help From Our Office?				
No	10	37.0	10	37.0
Yes	17	63.0	27	100.0

AB158.1

Table 7

Items Related to Performance as Viewed by
Those Outside Miami-Dade Community College

	Poor		Mediocre		Average		Good		Excellent		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Timeliness of Topic Frequency Missing = 9	0	-	0	-	1	5.3	12	63.1	6	31.6	19	100.0
Accuracy Frequency Missing = 9	0	-	0	-	0	-	9	47.4	10	52.6	19	100.0
Readability of Reports Frequency Missing = 5	0	-	0	-	0	-	10	43.5	13	56.5	23	100.0
Knowledge of State-Level Issues Frequency Missing = 6	0	-	1	4.6	1	4.6	6	27.3	14	63.6	22	100.0
Relevancy of Reports Frequency Missing = 5	0	-	0	-	1	4.4	9	39.1	13	56.5	23	100.0
Leader in Appropriate Issues Frequency Missing = 5	0	-	0	-	3	13.0	2	8.7	18	78.3	23	100.0
Helpfulness to Others in Field Frequency Missing = 8	0	-	0	-	2	10.0	5	25.0	13	65.0	20	100.0

Appendix A

Surveys and Correspondence

March 15, 1991

MEMORANDUM

TO: IR Staff

FROM: Marcia Belcher Marcia

SUBJECT: EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

One of the mandates of the accreditation process is an on-going evaluation of the Institutional Research office. Dr. Losak has asked me to design a possible evaluation for our office. It is attached in outline form along with three potential surveys for three different user groups. One group consists of the current list of M-DCC people who receive our capsules and abstracts. A second group of users would consist of M-DCC people who made special information requests; this would require keeping track of the names of everyone you did special jobs for. The third group would consist of people outside of M-DCC who might be knowledgeable about our operations.

Would you please review these documents keeping the following questions in mind:

--Does this document cover what should be covered in evaluating an IR office?

--Will the answers to these questions prove useful?

--Are there wording changes that need to be made?

--Is this a workable process?

--Do other groups need to be surveyed?

Please forward your comments to me or Dr. Losak.

MJB:ab

WP131

Proposal for Evaluating
Institutional Research

Section 3 of the Criteria for Accreditation published by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) includes a section on institutional research. SACS mandates evaluation of the IR office:

3.2 INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

Because institutional research can provide significant information on all phases of a college or university program, it is an essential element in planning and evaluating the institution's success in carrying out its purpose. The nature of the institutional research function depends on the size and complexity of the institution and may vary from a part-time operation to an office staffed by several persons. All institutions, however, must engage in continuous study, analysis and appraisal of their purposes, policies, procedures and programs. Institutions should assign administrative responsibility for carrying out institutional research. Institutional research should be allocated adequate resources, and those responsible for it should be given access to all relevant information. Institutions regularly must evaluate the institutional research function.

The following is an outline for evaluating M-DCC's **Institutional Research (IR)** office. The evaluation is based on assumptions about what constitutes an effective IR office.

I. Assumptions of What Is A Good IR Office

A. Is visible
B. Is productive
C. Anticipates & meets the needs of its users
D. Provides information that influences decision-making
E. Is timely
F. Is accurate and unbiased

II. Who Will be Surveyed?

A. Current list of M-DCC Personnel who Receive Abstracts & Capsules (see Survey for Readership)

B. M-DCC Users who Have Made Individual Information Requests to IR (see Survey for Individual Requests)

C. State-level Users (see State-level survey)
   1. Division of Community Colleges
   2. PEPC
   3. Other IR Directors in Florida

III. **Survey Methodology**

A. M-DCC Readership List -- Annual Questionnaire to all on current address list

B. Individual Users -- Maintain list of names & send survey to those making special requests to IR in past 6 months.

C. State-level users -- Send survey to every other year to:
   1. DCC -- Campbell, Parker, Maxwell
   2. PEPC -- Odum & all research staff
   3. IR Director at each Florida community college

IV. **Other Indicators**

A. Number of Requests (as indicator of filling need)
   1. Internally
   2. Externally

B. Number of Reports (as indicator of productiveness)

C. Number of Presentations (as indicator of productiveness, visibility)

D. Number of pages (as indicator of productiveness)

E. Number of visitors (as indicator of visibility)

F. Timeliness of state & federal reports

G. Accuracy of state and federal reports

H. Committee Service of staff members (as indicator of visibility)

I. Number of external publications (as indicator of visibility)

J. Anecdotal information on use of IR data in decision-making

MJB:ab
3/14/91

WP127

Institutional Research
Offices: 25 N.E. Second Street
Miami, FL 33132-2104
(305) 347-7445
FAX (305) 347-7495

MIAMI-DADE
COMMUNITY COLLEGE
District Administration

John Losak, Ph.D.
Dean of Institutional Research

April 25, 1991

Dear Colleague:

According to our sometimes faulty records you receive our Abstracts on a routine basis. We are in the process of gearing up for our next SACS re-affirmation and Section 3.2 of the Criteria requires an evaluation of the Institutional Research function. It seemed to me that colleagues who are familiar with our office would be in the best position to aid us toward achieving that goal. In addition, one of the recommendations of the Teaching/Learning Project is to have a systematic evaluation of each service area.

Marcia Belcher and I have developed the survey and have refined the items based on feedback from a pilot run. I hope you will take the time from your busy schedule to complete the survey and return to us at your earliest convenience. Any additional suggestions you have would be welcomed.

Thanks for your help.

John Losak

JL:ab

Mailing Address: 300 N.E. Second Avenue, Miami, FL 33132-2297

Survey for Institutional Research Readership

What is your role? (check one)
_____Department chairperson
_____Dean or Associate Dean
_____Vice-president/President
_____Other Professional Role
_____Faculty

Area of responsibilities (check one)
_____Academic Affairs
_____Student Services
_____Business & Finance
_____Classroom
_____Multiple Areas

Do you RECEIVE Institutional Research publications?

____Yes (please continue)
____No (please return survey now)

Do you READ (or skim) the Institutional Research publications you receive?
____Yes, almost all of them
____Yes, many of them
____Yes, a few of them
____No

If yes, what was one that you recall as being particularly interesting or helpful?

_____

What was one that needed improvement?

_____

Do you SHARE information contained in the Institutional Research publications with others?
____Yes, often
____Yes, occasionally
____No

If yes, what is one publication you remember sharing?

_____

Using the following scale, please rate the Institutional Research publications on the following characteristics:

```
---------1----------2----------3----------4----------5---------
       Poor       Mediocre    Average      Good      Excellent
```

_____Timeliness of topic
_____Usefulness of information for decision-making
_____Readability
_____Accuracy
_____Ability to sustain interest in topic
_____Objectivity

(continued on next page)

What do you think is the Institutional Research office's greatest strength?

What would most improve Institutional Research's performance?

What issue or topic would you like to see Institutional Research address during the next six months?

****

Some people make requests of Institutional Research for information that is not already available in published form. Did you work with our office in the past six months to get data that were not readily available?

_____yes (please continue)
_____no (please return survey now)

If yes, using the scale below, please respond to the following statements:

1=strongly disagree
2=disagree
3=neutral
4=agree
5=strongly agree

_____1. The information I received was useful.
_____2. I received the information within a reasonable period of time.
_____3. I understood the information I received.
_____4. The person who worked with me was helpful.
_____5. The person who worked with me was knowledgeable.
_____6. When I have a specialized data request, I will work again with Institutional Research.

Comments:

Thank you. Return to Institutional Research, Bonnie McCabe Hall, Wolfson Campus.

MJB:ab
4/24/91
WP128

Miami, FL
(305)
FAX (305)

MIAMI-DADE
COMMUNITY COLLEGE
District Administration

John Losak, Ph.D.
Dean of Institutional

April 25, 1991

Dear Colleague:

We are in the process of gearing up for our next SACS re-affirmation and Section 3.2 of the **Criteria** requires an evaluation of the Institutional Research function. It seemed to me that colleagues who are familiar with our office would be in the best position to aid us toward achieving that goal.

Marcia Belcher and I have developed the survey and have refined the items based on feedback from a pilot run. I hope you will take the time from your busy schedule to complete the survey and return to us at your earliest convenience. Any additional suggestions you have would be welcomed.

Thanks for your help.

John Losak

JL:ab

Mailing Address: 300 N.E. Second Avenue, Miami, FL 33132-2297

Survey of Individuals Around the State Who Work with Institutional Research Information

What is your role?

_____Work for the Division of Community Colleges
_____Work for the Postsecondary Educational Planning Commission
_____Director of a Community College Institutional Research Office
_____Other _____

Are you familiar with the work of Miami-Dade Community College's Office of Institutional Research?

_____Yes, I am very familiar
_____Yes, I am somewhat familiar
_____No (please return survey now)

Have you used the results of any of M-DCC's studies in your own work?

_____Yes In what area(s)?_____
_____No

Have you sought help or information from our office?

_____Yes
_____No

Using the following scale, please give your overall assessment of the performance of M-DCC's Office of Institutional Research on the following characteristics:

```
----------1----------2----------3----------4----------5---------
     Poor       Mediocre     Average      Good       Excellent
```

_____Timeliness
_____Accuracy
_____Readability of research reports
_____Knowledge of state-level issues
_____Relevancy of reports
_____Leadership in conceptualizing appropriate research issues
_____Helpfulness to others in the field

Comments:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Thank you. Please return to Office of Institutional Research, Miami-Dade Community College, 300 N.E. 2nd Avenue, Miami, FL 33132-2297

MJB:ab
4/24/91
WP130

Appendix B

SURVEY OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH READERSHIP

Responses Related to Institutional Research Publications Questions

Do you read (or skim) the Institutional Research publications you receive?
If yes, what was one that you recall as being particularly interesting or helpful?

- Lottery Money.
- CLAST information; enrollment makeup.
- Student Profile.
- Research Abstracts.
- Graduate Profiles.
- Closing Program Enrollment Data R.R. No. 90-07R [Subsequent Performance of Students Scoring in the 206-209 Range on the Florida Multiple Assessment Programs and Services (FL-MAPS) Elementary Algebra Subtest].
- I am particularly concerned about CLAST, and have appreciated the ones on that subject.
- Interested in Demographic info.
- 1990 Student Profile.
- Headcount/FTE - Semester/Year.
- Anything on student demographics, BSA, CLAST.
- I am very grateful for the information. I use it all the time.
- Annual Student Profiles - 90-25R [Annual Student Profile for the Academic Year 1989-90].
- All dealing with CLAST.
- Success rate on CLAST.
- Stats/info on minority composition of student body.
- Ethnic breakdown/CLAST.
- Reports of CLAST scores.
- CLAST results.
- CLAST.
- Information on CLAST results as well as MAPS results.
- All are helpful.
- Annual Fall Profile, various CLAST reports and analyses.
- Composition enrollment statistics. College Factbook.
- Enrollment analyses, end of term and CLAST and high school info - feeder patterns, etc.
- All are interesting.
- Enrollment growth of.....
- Data on program enrollment, completion, etc.
- Research abstract on ethnic makeup of students and how each performs at M-DCC.
- 91-06R [High School Draw: Direct Entry Enrollment of Dade County Public High School Graduates by Ethnic Category] - Among many others over many years.

- Ones involving student info (e.g. test scores, applicants, attrition (retention).
- 90-24R [Who Are Late Registrants and What Will They Do When Faced With a Late Registration Fee?].
- As CLAST coordinator, I find all research related to CLAST important.
- Most of them.
- Overview of M-DCC data and projections.
- High School enrollment results on M-DCC campuses.
- Report No. 90-23R [Program Review: A Five Year Summary of Placement and Follow-Up Information for Students in Associate in Science Degree Programs - 1984-85 Through 1988-89].
- Change in make-up of the student body.
- Retention of M-DCC first-time-in college #89-06R [Retention of Miami-Dade Community College First-Time-in-College Students Who Began by Enrolling in Selected College Preparatory Courses] - Performance of M-DCC in Oct 1990 CLAST.
- Basic skill testing outcomes/CLAST performance.
- ACT Survey - Post-secondary plans/High school Enrollment Draw.
- Annual Student Profile Year 89-90.
- Remedial student data as well as all student profile info.
- Data pertaining to demographics and Basic Skills levels of entering students.
- M-DCC in the Year 2000.
- Research Report No. 91-05R [The Community College and Transfer: Some Indicators From State Data].
- Subsequent Performance of Students Scoring in the 206-209 Range on the FI-MAPS.
- Those related to retention and success (i.e. CLAST, Graduation, etc.)
- I find the CLAST results by campus useful. I found the one on attracting superior students by draw good. The one on the College was interesting.
- Do Students Get What They Want (1988)?
- Profile of Student Population.
- d.k.
- All are helpful from a college performance CLAST and Profiles and CPT/ESL.
- Enrollment projection/productivity data.
- Student profiles, CLAST results, feeder school info.
- Mostly Medical Center Campus trends, data, etc.
- "Capsules" series is very interesting.
- No. 89-28R [Factors That Affect Success in Nursing]; 89-26R [Program Review: A Longitudinal Study of Associate in Science Degree Programs - 1983-84 Through 1988-89]; 90-06R [High School Draw: Direct Entry Enrollment of Dade County Public High School Graduates by Ethnic Category].
- Data on CLAST and MAPS.
- Student enrollment, statistics.
- The various reports on enrollment.
- I don't recall one above the others -- almost all are interesting and helpful.
- High school draw reports; enrollment reports.
- The ones that are concerned with enrollment/trends or retention.

- CLAST results - ethnic.
- Total # of students/academic yr/ethnicity/campus.
- Annual Student Profile for 1989-90 - Report # 90-25R.
- Research on results of the CLAST.
- The one reflecting the increase in minority enrollment.
- CLAST scores, enrollment breakdown, high schools in order.
- Since I'm less than a year here, Institutional Research abstracts.

What was one that needed improvement?

- None
- n/a
- n/a
- More information on foreign students, their CLAST, MAPS scores, etc.
- n/a
- ?
- Questions about student advisement should ask where the service was received. Too often it is assumed that advisement occurs only in the central office.
- Nothing
- Sometimes text is not as good as one would hope for.
- Can't remember any specific one that needed improvement.
- One dealing with CLAST
- Can't recall any.
- Could InterAmerican Center statistics be separated from Wolfson Campus?
- Not exact title, but the one that dealt with grade inflation.
- None comes to mind.
- Graduation statistics by groups.
- n/a
- None that I recall.
- Did not keep one -
- None - Very well done!
- n/a
- None come to mind.
- Can't recall.
- Success in College Prep and ESL Programs.
- CLAST scores broken out by 1) completers after 1st time; 2) analysis of which items in reading SC students miss. Not just macro breakout.
- Some are extremely esoteric and do not explain statistical data.
- d.k.
- I can recall none specifically, info generally brief on retention and college prep.,
- Some of our program listings are still incorrect in your files--fouls up the numbers.
- Prefer abstracts that include summary results.
- None that I read.
- None noted!
- ?
- None.
- ?

Do you SHARE information contained in the Institutional Research publications with others?

If yes, what is one publication you remember sharing?

- Enrollment information.
- High School Draw.
- Abstract on Make-up of Student Population - South.
- General enrollment information.
- Closing Program Enrollment Data R.R. No. 90-07R [Subsequent Performance of Students Scoring in the 206-209 Range on the Florida Multiple Assessment Programs and Services (FL-MAPS) Elementary Algebra Subtest].
- Do not recall.
- Student Profile.
- CLAST MAPS Cut Offs - % of Students.
- Academic Alert evaluation; student demographics.
- Enrollment changes and H.S. enrollment breakdown by school, year, etc.
- Something on CLAST.
- CLAST info.
- Minority enrollment.
- As Director of Grants, I use data in grants writing.
- Ethnic breakdown/CLAST.
- CLAST Results/Demographics.
- Demographic data on high school feeds patterns.
- Testing scores - comparisons on numbers of students scoring into developmental.
- CLAST analyses.
- Success data.
- End of term (Fall).
- Several, including above, enrollment changes, A.A. transferred problems, etc.
- Research Abstract on ethnic make-up of students and how each performs at M-DCC.
- 91-06R [High School Draw: Direct Entry Enrollment of Dade County Public High School Graduates by Ethnic Category] - Among many others.
- Retention.
- 90-24R [Who Are Late Registrants and What Will They Do When Faced With a Late Registration Fee?].
- CLAST results from last administration.
- Daycare/childcare.
- All CLAST reports.
- Report No. 90-23R [Program Review: A Five Year Summary of Placement and Follow-Up Information for Students in Associate in Science Degree Programs - 1984-85 Through 1988-89].
- Change in student body make up.
- Retention of M-DCC first-time-in college #89-06R [Retention of Miami-Dade Community College First-Time-in-College Students Who Began by Enrolling in

Selected College Preparatory Courses] - Performance of M-DCC in Oct 1990 CLAST - Annual Student Profile.

- None specifically.
- H.S. enrollment draw/Lottery Funds (?).
- Retention of M-DCC students (First-time-in Coll).
- Report back to the High Schools.
- Comparative MAPS scores by campus.
- Impact of increasing MAPS cutscores.
- Subsequent Performance of Students Scoring in the 206-209 Range on the FI-MAPS.
- Every publication.
- CLAST results. High School Draw by Quartiles.
- Research Report # 90-06R [High School Draw: Direct Entry Enrollment of Dade County Public High School Graduates by Ethnic Category]
- The Fact Book all the time.
- All that can be used as recruitment info.
- Success of ESL and relation to MAPS vs. CPT CLAST.
- Longitudinal enrollment/college profiles, CLAST info.
- Student profiles, CLAST results, feeder school info.
- Don't recall -- probably student services.
- Our copy is put on file in library. All are available (abstracts) and we help others locate and request full reports.
- Information Capsules 1989 and 1990 and 89-28R [Factors That Affect Success in Nursing].
- All of them are posted.
- Breakdown on stats from the high schools.
- Student enrollment, statistics.
- Enrollment info.
- MAPS scores and Med Center students/extensive studies on nursing.
- High school draw report.
- The ones that are concerned with enrollment/trends or retention.
- Enrollment information.
- I share most by forwarding to my staff.
- Have used reports about enrollment in articles or professional presentations.
- The demographics of students from fall 1990.

Appendix C

Responses to the Question "What do you think is the Institutional Research office's greatest strength?" Sorted by Content

DATA ACCESS AND QUALITY

- Accuracy of information - Relevancy of information.
- Accurate and objective data regarding students especially their CLAST, MAPS scores across campuses, over time.
- Producing information about student demographics and performance.
- Information for decision-making.
- Longitudinal studies on graduates success which answer many questions that most inst. don't have the ability with which to deal. Allows us to truly measure the success and/or impact of our programs.
- Internal statistical survey of students/profiles of in-coming and out-going students.
- Routine info we consistently gather.
- Thoroughness of reports. Issues which concern M-DCC.
- Access to data, time to compile and analyze data.
- Accessibility to data not available to others, or readily available to others.
- Distribution of information regarding college's status on academic and student-related issues.
- Providing data or info for grant writing.
- Data collection and analyses.
- Availability of statistics.
- Information provides for key issues such as MAPS, CLAST, Ethnic/Racial mix, etc.
- Generating statistical reports.
- The capacity for obtaining revelant information.
- College-wide data.
- Gathering data.
- It's access to the computer!
- Data relevance.
- Accuracy in reporting.
- Disseminating statistical data.
- Reporting "Stats" on the ever changing college community.
- Data dissemination.
- Gathering and disseminating data.
- Its accessibility and usefulness of information.

PROACTIVE STANCE

- Timely information.
- Timeliness of data.
- You seem on top of inst.

- The ability to "predict" what information I need. By the time I think about it, I receive it in the mail.
- Anticipation: staying one step ahead.
- Spotting need to know information before people realize they need to know it.
- Doing what it does and trying to anticipate the needs of the many different groups with the college.
- A broad and active investigatory stance.
- Timeliness - significance of research topics.

PERSONNEL/HUMAN RESOURCES

- High quality of staff.
- Personnel and their strengths/talents.
- Competent staff, highly professional.
- Exceptional staff that is always ready to help.
- Professional responsiveness.
- A very qualified, cooperative staff.
- Expertise.
- The helpfulness of its people -- especially Marcia Belcher.
- The availability of personnel to work with campus faculty and administration.
- Competent/intelligent people.
- Prof. work.

HELPFULNESS/FLEXIBILITY

- Receptive to assist in accurately implementing new regulations and statistics (Track Record Disclosure form).
- Ability to respond when needed.
- -Availability to discuss issues.
  -Provides needed documentation for initiatives, positions, strategies.
  -Helps to frame the issues and problems, provides parameters for understanding dimensions of identified problems.
- Depth/breadth of information collected and shared willingness to work with others - other areas to obtain data and analyze.
- Ability to provide unique data upon request.
- Always very cooperative.
- Very helpful to our special projects.
- Ability to provide information on request.
- Response to college concerns.

OTHER

- Support statistically the open. Keep us honest.
- Objectivity.
- Objectivity in reporting.
- Excellence in all of the characteristics in previous item.

- Broad scope of reports and timeframe in which it is disseminated.
- Relativity of content to student population.
- Its ability to put data available into meaningful contexts.
- ?
- Series of research reports and the breath of topics.
- Selection of research topics; data collection, reporting, and interpretation; information.
- Awareness/documentation for reports to State press, etc.
- Objectivity.

Appendix D

Responses to the Question "What would most improve Institutional Research's performance?" Sorted by content

PLANNING AND LINKING

- A planning function that would link research results to programmed activities in individual units.
- Establishing cooperatively a project list before the beginning of any year.
- Yearly meetings with campus adm. team to discuss what additional research would be beneficial.
- Availability for additional tasks and more input as to areas of investigation and reports.
- Prioritizing projects.
- More departmental input (research requested/needed by specific academic departments).

CAMPUS LEVEL FOCUS

- Better awareness by the campuses of available assistance.
  IR reps at each campus.
- Not enough campus based info.
- More campus focused, specifically addressing needs of various disciplines, although samples may be smaller.
- More campus specific focus that may be desired by only one or two campuses.
- Campus data, especially on issues such as CLAST. Program evaluation.
- Response to campus ? concerns.
- Expertise - More emphasis in campus needs with people here (Physically) to work with us on student learning issues.
- Ability to respond to needs of campus/department/faculty.
- More campuses power

CHANGES IN PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

- Probably wider exposure.
- I'm sure its performance is excellent. I think the fact book is full of good info, but such an amateur design that it is a turn off. Do we send that out?
- Verbal discussion of some results.
- An overview written in common sense language instead of statistics.
- Shorter articles.
- The clarity, writing can be improved. It's hard not to get lost in lots of figures, and some reports make that especially difficult.
- Periodic briefings on recent trends and developments of concern to decision-makers.
- Publication in national periodicals and presentation at significant workshops.

RESOURCES

- As with most areas of the college increased resources.
- More resources for campus level research.
- On-line access to statistics from shadow terminals - College-wide.
- Send data via network.
- More staffing.

TOPICS

- Less emphasis on CLAST scores.
- It may not be IR's role, but it would be helpful if the College did a better job of tracking graduates so that it would be possible to determine some of the outcomes of the M-D experience.
- Exploring some of the data more to account for variance caused by other factors other than those over analyzed in the topics.
- Would love to see qualitative data from time to time.

OTHER

- I would love to have a cumulative index of the abstracts. It would really help in searching for data.
- No concrete suggestions.
- ?
- ?
- Nothing, keep up good work.
- I'm satisfied.
- n/a
- Satisfied with service - More than ample!
- n/a
- Greater sensitivity to requests for information that may not "acceptable" to higher administrators.
- d.k.
- None noted!
- None at the time.
- No comment.
- n/a

Appendix E

Responses to the Question "What issue or topic would you like to see Institutional Research address during the next six months?" Sorted by content

OUTCOMES AND EFFECTIVENESS MEASURES

- Where are they in school? How well are they doing?
- Student Right to Know legislation.
  1. Athletics.
  2. Graduation rates.
- How are students in the A.S. programs doing as far as landing jobs in their fields/and another---Do they advance and if so, how quickly, reputation of our A.S. programs in the community.
- I'd like to see more information about student performance in college preparatory courses and what happens to these students over time. The same with required ENC and MAT sequence.
- Topics selected by campuses concerning performance of students.
- Continued research on the impact of CLAST on minority success, measurement of the impact of the new faculty advancement procedures. (Difficult, I know, but important to get some measurement of the impacts level of success).
- How does M-DCC rank nationally. What are salaries of graduates.
- Graduation rates within programs broken down further with additional follow-up reports. New report on reasons for student withdrawals.
- Follow-up on A.A. graduates per discipline.
- Campus projects to improve CLAST scores - to help us evaluate direction.
- More program retention studies.
- Minority success ratios by ethnic origins.
- Effectiveness of PSAV programs.
- Develop yardsticks by which to measure acad. department effectiveness.
- A.S. nursing students at M-DCC and institutions they transfer to.
- -Graduation rates of entering students based upon MAPS test results.
  -Colleges where our students transfer.
  -What happens to terminal AS students--Do they find work, where?
- The completion role of a cohort of students taking CLAST. An analysis by skill of student performance on CLAST Reading for 3 to 5 years to help pinpoint which skills we need to emphasize. A plan to allow faculty to check success of students on CLAST on a reasonable demand basis.
- Retention rate of students on financial aid - specify type of financial aid and retention with GPA.
- Detailed retention items by campuses.

TEACHING/LEARNING

- More research on teaching.
- Faculty Profile.
- Effectiveness of part-time instructors - course success rates; student evaluation, etc.
- Decisions about ESL (College preparatory based on success/completion and ability to move forward).
- Study of faculty assignment patterns.
- More thorough examination of College Prep and ESL programs.
- More emphasis in campus needs with people here (physically) to work with us on student learning issues.
- Work on performance review and student evaluation.
- Class size and student performance; pt. fac. vs. full time faculty\compare student outcomes in CLAST or English departmental exams.

STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS AND PROFILES

- A full profile on foreign students - how well they perform in English classes and their English writing and reading scores on MAPS.
- PSAV issues such as characteristics of students enrolled in various courses and comparisons of TABE test results to other tests taken and to demographics.
- Again - having the InterAmerican Center statistics - i.e. MAPS scores - CLAST scores. Ethnic makeup - etc., separated from Wolfson Campus. Perhaps as subsection of the Wolfson Campus.
- A more comprehensive study of the M-DCC student, along the lines of the Astin report, but not as totally comprehensive. That would be asking too much. Attitudes and characteristics of students.
- 1) Hispanic students at risk in Dade County.
  a. High school graduates (public/private schools).
  b. College graduation vs. college admission ratio.
- Info. re: marketing efforts - What are students looking for when they approach M-DCC? How are the college areas responding i.e. advising, etc.? - What zip codes do our students live in? - What are the incomes in those zip codes? Did they vote in the last election within that zip code?
- Shifting enrollment patterns in public and private high schools.

ATTITUDES AND BELIEFS

- Why H.S. students enroll at M-DCC? What do H.S. counselors think M-D can do for the students?
- Student needs - personal, social, emotional.
- Public opinion about the College.
- Public perceptions of the college's economic impact on the community.

FINANCIAL

- Actual Budget expenditures and savings from reductions.
- I would be interested in learning more about instructional costs at the various campuses and by subject discipline-per pupil.
- Impact of fee increases.
- Impact of fee increases on enrollment.
- The effects of the Budget cuts on services to the students and the public.
- Equitability of funding among campuses.
- The effect of fall tuition increases on enrollment. Has the recession affected enrollment? How?

OTHER

- You didn't ask, but: I like the way you send brief abstracts of reports, and we can request the full report if we like.
- Medical Center Campus - Data Base for Management.
- Deal with goals, aims and missions of M-DCC and NWSA.
- How to download research summaries to allow additional data sorting or query.
- Analysis of the service area in the context of our impending referendum campaign.
- Present output is sufficiently comprehensive.
- a) More cultural diversity; b) Distinctions among campuses - on funds, programs, student retention and graduation factors.
- Not sure.
- n/a
- -Why is the class drop rate so high?
  -How does that compare with other institutions?
  -Are there characteristics of dropping students that are similar?
- A serious study reflecting why the GPA is higher during the Spring and Summer.
- d.k.
- Each directive on the student's A.A. program review.
- None noted!
- Impact of displaced Eastern workers.
- Open door policy.
- Compare college organizational models with M-DCC's.
- A survey of Dade County's business and industry offices that would reveal their job-entry expectations.

Appendix F

General Comments

- Solid operation. Receptive to College informational needs.
- Thanks. Lee Kline
- I hope that we can increase our commitment.
- I find the IR briefs very helpful - I can ask for complete report if needed but don't have to wade through them otherwise - in addition, I am kept fairly up to date on what information is available.
- IR provides valuable services.
- Have always found area to be helpful within time constraints and available personnel.
- IR needs stronger program to publicize uses of its excellent products and services. Range of users is limited in relation to magnitude of IR efforts and potential utility of its output.
- A project to assess the effectiveness of our ENC2301 CLAST sections stalled because of limited sample - we need to try again! You have been tremendously helpful to me over the years!
- Keep up the good work!
- A great office and useful and helpful - all the time! Keep going!
- Thank you for the valuable services your office provides.
- I am presently working in a project, and I am still seeking information from you.
- I.R. is one of the colleges most responsive and professional units.
- I think IR does a terrific job. My comments all reflect a desire for more information. Not less or better. Keep up the good work.
- Extremely pleased with one response received along with the publications research. Thank you.
- District publications has design expertise. In addition, there is a standard look for college publications which has been adopted. We would like to design your next fact book especially the cover.
- The only problem I see is college vs. campus data. I recommend more interface (collegewide) with the campus academic areas.
- Think some of your publications are redundantly expensive--like the summary book that comes out at end of year. Not necessary in tight budget-time especially since I file all that I want.
- Info had to be obtained elsewhere.
- Staff is knowledgeable and adept at explaining and interpreting data in writing and orally. Reports and information is usually comprehensive. I rely on your office for accurate and timely information.
- The department is super!
- Good service.

AB070

Appendix G

SURVEY OF INDIVIDUALS AROUND THE STATE WHO WORK WITH INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH INFORMATION

Have you used the results of any of M-DCC's studies in your own work?

- In about four or five different areas.
- Informally - College prep.
- Background materials for legislative studies.
- CLAST
- CLAST
- I have used your research design and abstract format. In addition, I have used institutional effectiveness information.
- CLAST
- CLAST
- CLAST, Student Demographics, Institutional Effectiveness.
- Institutional Research Project to Assist Administrative Staff.
- Student performance on the CLAST.
- Student retention, CLAST test scores, student financial aid, campus expansion.
- CLAST and entry test score studies -- Remediation studies and retention studies.
- Student Assessment, Entry and Testing, CLAST.
- Ideas for assessment of student learning outcomes.
- Comparing M-DCC results with these of similar studies at my college.
- CLAST
- CLAST; Follow-up

Comments:

- From what I have observed, M-DCC's research office does a very thorough job. Unfortunately for small colleges with limited staff and resources, M-DCC's research often (& quite understandably) supports positions which favor large schools over smaller ones (such as recent Perkins formula, cost differential, etc.).

- I value the priority that M-DCC places on institutional research. My work has benefitted several times from the work of the M-DCC institutional research office.

- I have worked with Cathy Morris of the IR office in particular. She always has a thorough knowledge of State databases and of the implication of IR questions for policy. As in most things, Miami-Dade is a leader statewide, and probably nationally.

- I have always received a prompt answer to any questions I have directed to your office. Your willingness to help other Fla. CC's is appreciated.

- We are a small college and have very little opportunity to perform extended research. We envy the role that M-DCC plays. Keep up the good work and leadership.

- The researchers are respected for their effort to help with decision-making at M-DCC and institutions throughout the State.

- Possibly the best IR office in the State. You have consistently set standards for the rest of us to follow.

- Have you done an internal evaluation of how helpful your office is to M-DCC constituents? This role would seem much more relevant/important P.S. Why didn't you send us a return envelope.

- A recommendation for further enhancement of study results...include information on specific selection criteria used (e.g., test scores, exclusions, definitions for FTIC, etc.) with a contact name for the purpose of providing technical assistance (answering questions).

- M-DCC - OIR establishes the goal line for all other institutions.

- The M-DCC Institutional Research office is the most outstanding one in the C.C. system and as good as any in the State University System. It is a national model for community colleges.

- It is a professional operation.

- Have not used reports.

- I do not know how many reports you initiate without being requested to do so. I survey chief administrative officers to get their assessment of the usefulness of IR information for their decision-making.

- I have always found reading your Research Reports professionally stimulating and informative.

AB070.1

SUGGESTED TOPICS	IR STUDY
OUTCOMES AND EFFECTIVENESS MEASURES	
•Where are they in school? How well are they doing?	R.R.91-05R
• Student Right to Know legislation.	
1. Athletics.	
2. Graduation rates	R.R.91-05R R.R.91-16R
• How are students in the A.S. programs doing as far as landing jobs in their fields/and another---Do they advance and if so, how quickly, reputation of our A.S. programs in the community.	R.R.90-23R R.R.89-26R
• I'd like to see more information about student performance in college preparatory courses and what happens to these students over time. The same with required ENC and MAT sequence.	R.R.87-28
• Topics selected by campuses concerning performance of students.	
• Continued research on the impact of CLAST on minority success, measurement of the impact of the new faculty advancement procedures. (Difficult, I know, but important to get some measurement of the impacts level of success).	
• How does M-DCC rank nationally. What are salaries of graduates.	
• Graduation rates within programs broken down further with additional follow-up reports. New report on reasons for student withdrawals.	R.R.91-16R R.R.90-23R
• Follow-up on A.A. graduates per discipline	R.R.91-16R R.R.91-05R
• Campus projects to improve CLAST scores - to help us evaluate direction.	
• More program retention studies.	
• Minority success ratios by ethnic origins.	
• Effectiveness of PSAV programs.	
• Develop yardsticks by which to measure acad. department effectiveness.	
• A.S. nursing students at M-DCC and institutions they transfer to.	
• -Graduation rates of entering students based upon MAPS test results.	
-Colleges where our students transfer	R.R.91-05R R.R.87-25
-What happens to terminal AS students--Do they find work, where?	
• The completion role of a <u>cohort</u> of students taking CLAST. An analysis by skill of student performance on CLAST Reading for 3 to 5 years to help pinpoint which skills we need to emphasize. A plan to allow faculty to check success of students on CLAST on a reasonable demand basis.	
• Retention rate of students on financial aid - specify type of financial aid and retention with GPA.	
• Detailed retention items by campuses.	

SUGGESTED TOPICS	IR STUDY
TEACHING/LEARNING	
More research on teaching.	
• Faculty Profile.	
• Effectiveness of part-time instructors	R.R.84-29
Course success rates;	R.R.90-11R
Student evaluation, etc	R.R.91-09R
• Decisions about ESL (College preparatory based on success/ completion and ability to move forward)	I.C.90-14C
	R.R.88-09
• Study of faculty assignment patterns.	
• More thorough examination of College Prep and ESL programs.	
• More emphasis in campus needs with people here (physically) to work with us on student learning issues.	
• Work on performance review and student evaluation.	
• Class size and student performance; pt. fac. vs. full time faculty\compare student outcomes in CLAST or English departmental exams.	
STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS AND PROFILES	
• A full profile on foreign students - how well they perform in English classes and their English writing and reading scores on MAPS.	
• PSAV issues such as characteristics of students enrolled in various courses and comparisons of TABE test results to other tests taken and to demographics.	I.C.91-19C
• Again - having the InterAmerican Center statistics - i.e. MAPS scores - CLAST scores. Ethnic makeup - etc., separated from Wolfson Campus. Perhaps as subsection of the Wolfson Campus.	
• A more comprehensive study of the M-DCC student, along the lines of the Astin report, but not as totally comprehensive. That would be asking too much Attitudes and characteristics of students.	R.R.88-30 R.R.88-25 R.R.88-24
• 1) Hispanic students at risk in Dade County. a. High school graduates (public/private schools). b. College graduation vs. college admission ratio.	
• Info. re: marketing efforts - What are students looking for when they approach M-DCC? How are the college areas responding i.e. advising, etc.? - What zip codes do our students live in? - What are the incomes in those zip codes? Did they vote in the last election within that zip code?	R.R.89-22R R.R.89-19R R.R.89-12R I.C.89-11C R.R.89-08R
• Shifting enrollment patterns in public and private high schools.	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix H
(continued)

SUGGESTED TOPICS	IR STUDY
ATTITUDES AND BELIEFS	
• Why H.S. students enroll at M-DCC? What do H.S. counselors think M-D can do for the students?	R.R.89-22R R.R.89-19R R.R.89-12R I.C.89-11C R.R.89-08R
• Student needs - personal, social, emotional.	
• Public opinion about the College.	
• Public perceptions of the college's economic impact on the community.	
FINANCIAL	
• Actual Budget expenditures and savings from reductions.	
• I would be interested in learning more about instructional costs at the various campuses and by subject discipline-per pupil.	
• Impact of fee increases.	
• Impact of fee increases on enrollment.	
• The effects of the Budget cuts on services to the students and the public.	
• Equitability of funding among campuses.	
• The effect of fall tuition increases on enrollment. Has the recession affected enrollment? How?	
OTHER	
• You didn't ask, but: I like the way you send brief abstracts of reports, and we can request the full report if we like.	
• Medical Center Campus - Data Base for Management.	
• Deal with goals, aims and missions of M-DCC and NWSA.	
• How to download research summaries to allow additional data sorting or query.	
• Analysis of the service area in the context of our impending referendum campaign.	
• Present output is sufficiently comprehensive.	
• a) More cultural diversity; b) Distinctions among campuses - on funds, programs, student retention and graduation factors.	
• Not sure.	
• n/a	
• -Why is the class drop rate so high? -How does that compare with other institutions?	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SUGGESTED TOPICS	IR STUDY

-Are there characteristics of dropping students that are similar?

- A serious study reflecting why the GPA is higher during the Spring and Summer.
- d.k.
- Each directive on the student's A.A. program review.
- None noted!
- Impact of displaced Eastern workers.
- Open door policy.
- Compare college organizational models with M-DCC's.
- A survey of Dade County's business and industry offices that would reveal their job-entry expectations.